

REMARKS

The office action of July 9, 2003, has been carefully considered.

Claims 31-40 and 42-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Wolpert et al. in view of the patent to Szewczykowski.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Wolpert et al. in view of Szewczykowski, and further in view of the patent to Weinberger.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, applicant has canceled claims 22-30, 40, 41 and 45, and amended claims 31, 34-39, 42-44, 46 and 48-50.

It is further respectfully submitted that the claims now on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous

manner from the constructions and methods disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references, and particularly to the patent to Wolpert et al., it can be seen that this reference discloses a security device that has multiple security features and a method for making same. Wolpert et al. at the very least do not disclose an electronic circuit as in the presently claimed invention.

The patent to Szewczykowski discloses a method for identifying counterfeit negotiable instruments. The Examiner combined the teachings of Szewczykowski with Wolpert et al. in determining that claims 31-40 and 42-50 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of references does not teach the presently claimed invention. Szewczykowski teaches applying RF-ID tags, which contain random numbers and time of printing information, when the bank note is being printed. This information is simultaneously stored in a data base. When the bank note is later used at a bank, the information is read from the RF-ID tag and compared with the information stored in the data base. Only at this point is it possible to determine if the bank note is legitimate or

fraudulent. Szewczykowski gives no disclosure concerning the type or structure of the RF-ID tag. The Examiner states on page 3 of the Office Action that RF-ID tag contains one or more integrated circuits pressed, stamped or etched to form a thin layer, and when communicating with the host, the tag/antenna receives power and signal from the host and transmits response to the host. Applicant could not find where this is taught by Szewczykowski. Applicant requests that the Examiner indicate where this is taught in the Szewczykowski patent so that applicant can better consider the Examiner's position and respond more fully thereto. At present applicant respectfully submits that these features concerning the RF-ID tag as argued by the Examiner are not present in the teachings of Szewczykowski. However, even if one were to assume that the reference does teach these features, then Szewczykowski would only teach features a), b), and c) of claim 31. There is no teaching by the combination of Wolpert et al. and Szewczykowski of features d), e), g) and h) of claim 31. The combination would only teach substituting or adding the RF-ID tag of Szewczykowski for or to the magnetic strip of Wolpert et al. There is no teaching concerning the construction of the antenna and its connection to the chip as recited in claim 31 presently on file. Thus, the combination does not teach the features of claim 31, and

particularly not features e), g), and h).

Claim 32 shares features a)- g) of claim 31, and also adds that "the structure forming the circuit comprises an integrated polymer circuit chip formed on a flexible polymer substrate." These features are not taught by the combination of references relied upon by the Examiner.

Claim 33 shares features a), b), and c) with claim 31 and further recites that "the pattern serving as a sending/receiving antenna is applied externally to the paper layer and is coupled capacitively by the paper layer, acting as a dielectric, to a remaining portion of the circuit embedded in the paper layer." These features are not taught by the combination of references relied upon by the Examiner.

The references also do not teach the features recited in amended claim 44 presently on file.

The references also do not teach providing the document with an electronic circuit in an area separate from the area having the authenticity feature, in which electronic circuit the

authenticity feature determined by contactless detection is checked and an output signal indicating the result of checking is generated, as recited in claim 47 presently on file.

Relative to claim 48, Wolpert et al. teach a checking device in Fig. 5 that is a reader for a magnetic or metallic strip containing security features. Fig. 7 teaches a checking device having a plurality of capacitive sensors that are arranged parallel to the encoded metallic security feature 40. The magnetic security feature causes a capacitive coupling between neighboring sensors from which the structure of the security feature is determined (see column 9, lines 1-23). Neither Wolpert et al. nor teach the features of claim 48, namely, the electronic circuit chip and a pattern connected thereto serving as an antenna, which pattern is a dipole antenna with dipole branches extending along a common straight line. Furthermore, the combination of references does not teach a transport device by which the documents to be checked are transported along a movement path extending transverse to the common straight line of the dipole branches, as recited in claim 48. Also, the references do not teach the remaining features of claim 48, namely that the electronic circuit chip emits an output signal representing the

**LZ-44**

authenticity feature in response to a received input signal, and that the device comprises two conductors extending in the transport direction, one of them arranged in the area of the movement path of the one dipole branch and the other in the area of the movement path of the other dipole branch, respectively, for capacitive coupling with the moving dipole branches, and a sending/receiving device coupled with the conductors for emitting the input signal for the circuit chip and for receiving the output signal representing the authenticity signal. These features are not taught by the references.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 31-40 and 42-50 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

As for the patent to Weinberger, this has also been considered. Since it does not come closer to the presently claimed invention than the references discussed it is believed that any detailed comments thereon at this time would be superfluous. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 41 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is overcome and should be withdrawn.



LZ-44

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

By

Klaus P. Stoffel  
Reg. No. 31,668

For: Friedrich Kueffner

Reg. No. 29,482  
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 900  
New York, New York 10017  
(212) 986-3114

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

OCT 17 2003

RECEIVED

Dated: October 9, 2003

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on October 9, 2003.

By:

  
Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: October 9, 2003